

REMARKS

Status of the Claims

Claims 1-20 remain pending, Claims 21-36 having been canceled without prejudice.

Claims 21-25 and 27 Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Examiner has rejected Claims 21-25 and 27 as being unpatentable over Itokawa (U.S. Patent No. 6,636,644, hereinafter referred to as “Itokawa”) in view of Chen et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,625,212, hereinafter referred to as “Chen”) and Parikh et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,421,058, hereinafter referred to as “Parikh”). Regarding Claim 21, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of Chen to provide a memory which would also store object data for the system for quick and easy access to the data. Furthermore, he asserts that it would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of Parikh to provide a high performance graphics system allowing geometry to be rendered with many attributes.

14 Regarding Claim 22, the Examiner asserts that Itokawa discloses the terms of transparent and
15 opaque pixels.

16 Regarding Claim 23, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary
17 skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the teaching of Chen to provide a more precise
18 location of the pixel using coordinates in Itokawa.

19 Regarding Claim 24, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary
20 skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the teaching of Chen to provide a more precise
21 location of the pixel using coordinates in Itokawa.

Regarding Claim 25, the Examiner asserts that Itokawa discloses the step of padding the macroblock to accelerate MPEG4 video decoding by improving coding efficiency of padding.

24 Regarding Claim 27, the Examiner incorporates the statement presented above with respect to
25 Claim 21.

Claims Rejected Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

27 The Examiner has rejected Claim 26 as being unpatentable over Itokawa in view of Chen and
28 Parikh as applied to Claim 21 and further in view of Gallery et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,034,690,
29 hereinafter referred to as “Gallery”). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of
30 ordinary skill in the art to utilize the teaching of Gallery to provide the capability of processing

1 MPEG-2 data with higher speed.

2 The Examiner has rejected Claims 28-29 and 32- as being unpatentable over Itokawa in view
3 of Chen.

4 Regarding Claim 28, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary
5 skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the teaching of Chen to provide a memory which
6 would also store object data for the system for easy and quick access to the data.

7 Regarding Claim 29, the Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary
8 skill in the art at the time of the invention to utilize the teaching of Chen to provide the function of
9 quickly transferring data between different processing units in a system.

10 Regarding Claims 32-35, the Examiner incorporates the statement presented above with
11 respect to the rejection of Claims 22-25.

12 The Examiner has rejected Claim 30 as being unpatentable over Itokawa and Chen as applied
13 to Claim 28 and further in view of Kenyon et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,577,769, hereinafter referred to
14 as “Kenyon”). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the
15 art to utilize the teaching of Kenyon to provide the type of data bus for quickly transferring data
16 between different processing units in a system.

17 The Examiner has rejected Claim 31 as being unpatentable over Itokawa and Chen as applied
18 to Claim 28 and further in view of Butter et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,768,537, hereinafter referred to as
19 “Butter”). The Examiner asserts that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to
20 utilize the teaching of Butter to provide a buffer to temporarily store data until it is used to provide
21 better control of the processing order of the data.

22 Applicants respectfully disagree with each of these rejections and will be filing a continuation
23 application in which these rejections are specifically addressed in a Preliminary Amendment.
24 However, since Claims 21-36 have been canceled above, the Examiner’s rejection of these claims is
25 now moot in the present application.

26 The Examiner has acknowledged that the claims remaining in this application define a novel
27 and non-obvious invention. Accordingly, having canceled all rejected claims (without prejudice), the
28 application is in condition for allowance and should be passed to issue without further delay. Should
29 any further questions remain, the Examiner is invited to telephone applicants’ attorney at the number
30 listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Ron Anderson

Ronald M. Anderson
Registration No. 28,829

RMA/SKM:lrq

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service in a sealed envelope as first class mail with postage thereon fully prepaid addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on August 2, 2004.

Date: August 2, 2004

Linda Darrell